



## ATTACHMENT A

### Remarks

As discussed in more detail below, claims 25-28 and 36-41 have been rejected on prior art. Claims 1-3, 8-16, 18, 22, and 32-34 have been allowed. In order to expedite the prosecution, independent claim 25 has been amended to include the subject matter of two of the claims dependent thereon and it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now presented are in condition for allowance.

Turning to the rejection on prior art, claims 25-28 and 36-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being "anticipated by" the newly cited Bell patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed although, as discussed above, base claim 25 has been amended.

Before considering the Bell patent, it is noted that claim 25 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 36 as well as the subject matter of claim 41. Thus, claim 25, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, a menu identifying compatible devices within range of the second transducer and a menu interface driven by the menu for controlling establishment of voice channels, wherein the apparatus identifies further compatible devices by broadcasting a request for compatible third party devices within the range of the local area receiver to identify themselves and adds to the menu those compatible third party devices responding to the request.

The Bell patent discloses a "group call" system for a wireless mobile communication device using Bluetooth. The communication device or handset is configured for communicating by a cellular or PCS or cordless call over a first wireless point to a base station and "is also configured for communicating with one or more communication links over respective wireless direct device-to-device second links" implemented using Bluetooth. In rejecting claim 25, the Examiner has made specific reference to Figure 2 including microphone M and speaker S. While it is not seen that the Bell patent actually discloses a speaker coupled to combining means such that sound generated at the microphone is not played at the speaker, claim 25 has, as indicated above, been amended to include the subject matter of claims 36 and 41.

In rejecting claims 36 and 41, the Examiner has also made reference to Figure 2. However, it is respectfully submitted that there is nothing disclosed in Figure 2 or in the

description thereof or elsewhere in Bell of an apparatus that identifies compatible devices by broadcasting a request for compatible third party devices within the range of the local area receiver to identify themselves and adds to the menu compatible third party devices responding to the request. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25, as amended, is patentable for at least this reason.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that other dependent claims, such as claim 37, are separately patentable. Claim 37 recites that identification codes for further compatible devices are preprogrammed into the cellular telephones so as to enable the name of a person to be associated with each said further compatible device, and it is respectfully submitted that this feature is not taught or suggested by Bell.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

**END REMARKS**